

**REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of December 6, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 15 - 17 and 19 -28 have been re-examined. These claims are indicated as containing allowable subject matter. At the same time these claims have been rejected under 35 USC 112, under the first and second paragraphs. Under the first paragraph, the rejection is based on the fact that claim 15 defines a single rod with three oscillatory members, whereas the written text describes three rods. Under the second paragraph, the rejection is based on the fact of indefiniteness also because of the "single rod - three rods" difference. To overcome these rejection to thereby place this application in condition for allowance, claim 15 has been amended to delete the citation of "a single rod."

Claims 19 - 26 are objected to because they depend from a rejected claim. To overcome this objection, claims 19 - 26 have been amended to depend from claim 15.

Finally, the examiner objects to the drawings. In reply, REPLACEMENT SHEETS for Figs. 1 - 4 are being submitted herewith.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration is respectfully requested and claims 15 - 17 and 19-26 allowed.

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number 25,721

Date: March 6, 2008

**Customer Number \*23364\***  
**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\LOPA3008-EH0636\March 6 2008 Response.wpd